DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 318 940 CG 022 486

AUTHOR Steward, Robbie J.; Lynn, Betty Jane
TITLE A Study of Self-Esteem in Adopted Non-adopted Adolescents.
PUB DATE 87
NOTE 24p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Adolescents; *Adoption; College Students; Comparative Analysis; Higher Education; *Self Esteem

ABSTRACT

This study tested the hypothesis that adopted adolescents have lower self-esteem than do non-adopted adolescents. Male and female students (N=159) between the ages of 18 and 22 were conveniently sampled from college undergraduate populations. Forty-four of the participants reported adoptive status. Each participant completed the Coopersmith Self-Esteem Inventory (CSEI) and a personal data sheet. A multiple regression was used to examine the relationship between the dependent variable (scores obtained on the CSEI) and the independent variables (age, gender, number of siblings, mother's parenting style, father's parenting style, mother's age at time of birth or adoption, and father's age at time of birth or adoption). Data analysis yielded frequencies and a correlation matrix indicating relationships among all pairs of variables. Significant correlations were found between adoptive status and the following: mother's parenting style, mother's age at time of birth or adoption, and father's age at time of birth or adoption. Compared to non-adopted respondents, adoptees perceived their mothers to be more autocratic. Both mothers and fathers of adoptees tended to be older than mothers and fathers of non-adoptees at time of birth or adoption. The analysis revealed no significant correlations between adoptive status and self-esteem as measured by the CSEI. (Author/NB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED318940

A Study of Self-Esteem

In Adopted and Non-adopted Adolescents

[Robbie J. Steward]

[Betty Jane Lynn]

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Robbie J. Steward

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CG 022486

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Abstract

The current study tested the hypothesis that adopted adolescents have lower self-esteem than non-adopted adolescents. One hundred fifty-nine male and female students ages 18 through 22 were conveniently sampled from college undergraduate populations. Forty-four of the participants reported adoptive status. Each participant completed the Self-Esteem Inventory (CSEI) and a personal data sheet. A multiple regression was used to examine the relationship between the dependent variable (scores obtained on the CSEI) and the independent variables (age, sex, number of siblings, mother's parenting style, father's parenting style, mother's age at time of birth or adoption, and father's age at time of birth or adoption). Data analysis yielded frequencies and a correlation matrix indicating relationships among all pairs of variables. Significant correlations were found between adoptive status and the following: mother's parenting style, mother's age at time of birth or adoption. The analysis revealed no significant correlations between adoptive status and self-esteem as measured by the CSEI.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

INTRODUCTION

Adoption is the process that provides a means for relinquished children to be placed with substitute parents who can provide the family structure and stability required for optimal stability and development (Bernard, 1953). Lawton and Gross (1964) make the following distinctions:

> "The terms "adopted child" or "adoption"...mean the child who has been legally separated from his or her natural parents and placed with another husband and wife so that the adopting parents are now considered to have all the privileges and responsibilities concerning the child." (p. 635)

Adoption is also the socially acceptable means of legitimizing a child born out of wedlock and providing a family for infertile couples.

Regardless of the definition, adopted children have been found to experience life differently than those who are reared in the family into which they are born (Pringle, 1967). Clothier (1943) believes that "the trauma and the severing of the individual from his or her racial antecedents lies at the core of what is peculiar to the adopted child" (p. 222). Frisk (1964) states:

> "We must realize that the chances of developing disturbances during adolescence are great in the adopted child. Ego development, identification, and the forming of identity, together with the social environment, are inclined to become complicated. In the course of my studies of the adopted child, it has become apparent that a special problem in the formation of identity has been present." (p. 7)

Marcus (1981) reports that she shares the sentiments of other adoptees who feel robbed of their identity and enraged at the adoption system which denies basic human rights. Lifton (1979), also an adoptee, shares her feelings on what is is like to be adopted:

> Unlike the real orphan who still carries his family name, the Adoptee (sic) is cut off completely from his past. And though he has "psychological" parenting in the adoptive home, he suffers a severe physical deprivation in being cut off from anyone whose body might serve as a model for the wondrous and fearsome possibilities of his own. To explain this to the nonadopted is like asking the sighted to see into the dark isolation of the blind. Even the adopted, themselves, do not always perceive the period of the darkness within them. (p. 5)

The current literature on adoptees focuses on those factors leading to identity and self-concept development in adolescence. There are many narrative accounts of factors unique to identity formation in adoptees. Empirical studies of nonclinical populations of adoptees are limited and the evidence is conflicting and inconclusive as to whether adopted adolescents experience greater difficulty in developing and maintaining a positive self-concept than non-adopted individuals.

Self-esteem is the specific aspect of identity under consideration in this research. It is defined as the beliefs or attitudes one has about oneself. Self-esteem expresses an attitude of approval or disapproval and indicates the extent to which a person believes himself or herself to be capable, significant, successful, and worthy (Coopersmith, 1981). Erikson (1959) adds that "self-esteem, confirmed at the end of each major crisis, grows to be a conviction that one is learning effective steps toward a tangible future, that one is developing a defined personality within a social reality which one understand" (p. 89). In order to address self-esteem in adopted adolescents, the following section will examine the relationship between the concept of identity development and the adopted child.

To date only three studies have attempted to compare a nonclinical population of adopted and non-adopted adolescents on identity related issues. In each case the sample of adoptees was quite small and difficult to obtain.

Norvell and Guy (1977) sampled seven hundred and twenty-one college students in introductory sociology and psychology classes. Thirty-eight of the respondents were adopted. A non-adopted control group was randomly selected from the same population and matched for age, sex, race, and marital status. Using the Berger Self-Concept Scale, Norvell and Guy (1977) found no significant difference between the mean self-concept scores for adopted and non-adopted subjects. They concluded that adoptive status by itself is not a determinant of low self-esteem and suggested that negative elements in self-concept result form problems within the home.

Simmons (1980), on the other hand, confirmed his hypothesis that adoptees have more difficulty than non-adoptees in forming a clear, consistent sense of identity. He advertised for adopted participants through local and college newspapers; eighteen adoptees responded. The non-adopted individuals in this study were contacted through universities, factories and civic organizations. Eighteen individuals were matched as closely as possible with the adoptees on age, sibling size and order, parents' deaths and divorces, and subject's education level. The California Psychological Inventory, The Tennessee Self-Concept Scale, and Gough's Adjective Check List were mailed to each participant. Significant positive results were found on twelve of the nineteen scales which measured various aspects of identity. These test results substantiate the hypothesis that adoptees have difficulty forming a sense of identity.

The Delaware Family Study (Stein & Hoopes, 1985) on identity formation in adopted adolescents consisted of fifty adopted volunteers in the 10th through 12th grades. This sample was extracted from the original population of adoptive families in the longitudinal study begun in 1962. The non-adopted comparison group was selected from two high schools that approximated that of the adopted group. The instruments utilized in assessing identity ratings were the Tan Ego Identity Scale, the Offer Self-Image Questionnaire, and a Semistructured Interview. This study revealed that adopted

participants did not score lower than non-adoptees on measures of identity formation and adjustment as had been expected.

Results from these three studies are inconclusive because there is a contradiction in conclusions. This contradiction, however, does support the need for future examination of this issue. The purpose of the present study is to clarify the relationship between adoptive status and self-esteem as measured by the Coopersmith Self-Esteem Inventory.

The objectives of the present study are to examine the correlation between adoptive and non-adoptive status and to add to the body of literature with the intent of clarifying the relationship between adoptive status and self-esteem. The variables considered in addition to adoptive status are age, sex, number of siblings, mother's parenting style, father's parenting style, mother's age time of birth or adoption, and father's age at time of birth or adoption.

METHOD

Based on past research, it is inclonclusive whether adopted adolescents experience greater difficulty in the development of identity and self-esteem than their non-adopted counterparts. The present study was undertaken to add to the body of knowledge on the subject and to further define the issue.

Subject Selection

The subjects selected for this study were sampled from undergraduate college populations in the midwest. Participants were perceived to be completing the adolescent phase of their development in which identity related tasks are major issues. Self-esteem, a component of identity formation, is being addressed in this research study.

One hundred fifty-nine undergraduate male and female students ages 18 through 22 were conveniently sampled from introductory psychology and counseling psychology classes at the University of Kansas in Lawrence, Kansas and the Johnson County

Community College in Overland Park, Kansas. Forty-four of the respondents were adopted.

All students in three counseling psychology classes were sampled. Seventy-six students participated, six of whom reported adoptive status. Canvassing for students through the research pool in the psychology department resulted in 81 participants, 36 of whom were adopted. The remainder of the adoptees were recruited by the instructors in the introductory psychology classes at Johnson Community College. Adoptees were asked to complete the research instruments outside of class and return them the following class meeting. Two adoptees responded.

Test Administration

Each participant signed a consent form and completed The Coopersmith Self-Esteem Inventory (CSEI) and a personal data sheet.

Coopersmith Self-Esteem Inventory (CSEI). Coopersmith (1987) defines self-esteem as "...the evaluation a person makes and customarily maintains, of him-or herself; that is, overall self-esteem is an expression of approval of disapproval, indicating the extent to which a person believes him-or herself competent, successful, significant, and worthy" (p. 1). The Coopersmith Self-Esteem Inventory-Adult Form is a 25 item paper and pencil test designed to measure attitudes toward oneself in social, academic, family, and personal contexts. It was developed in conjunction with a study of self-esteem in children undertaken by Coopersmith in 1967 based on the belief that self-esteem is significantly associated with effective functioning and personal satisfaction. Over 100 studies of reliability and validity have been conducted on the CSEI. Internal consistency (KR20) coefficients range in the .80's. Stability correlations indicate that self-esteem becomes more stable as children move into adolescence. Total scores confirm the temporal stability of the CSEI. Test-retest coefficients for college students range in the .80's. Studies by Kokenes (1974, 1978) confirm the existence of construct validity for the CSEI. Concurrent validity is

evidenced through correlation with the SRA Achievement Series (Simon & Simon, 1975). The CSEI has been shown to be a fair predictor of reading achievement (Donaldson, 1974). Factor analysis revealed four pairs of bipolar factors which seem to be congruent with the CSEI subscales (Kokenes, 1973).

The personal data sheet designed by the researcher contained information which provided the variables for making comparisons between the adopted and non-adopted groups. Each participant completed Section I of the personal data sheet which asked for birthdate, sex, mother's and father's current marital status, number of siblings and whether they were adopted, and mother's and father's parenting style. Non-adoptees were asked to complete

Section I and Section II. Section II requested the age of each parent at the time of participants' birth, the length of parents' marriage at the time of the birth, and subjects' birth order within the family. Adoptees completed Section I and Section III. Section III requested the same information of the adoptees in regard to parents' age and length of marriage at the time of subjects' age and length of marriage at the time of subjects' adoption and the birth order of the participant. In addition adoptees were asked if they had been placed in a family that had younger children and how old they were when they learned they were adopted.

The parenting styles described in the personal data sheet are reflective of those studied by Enright, Lapsley, Dovas, and Fehr (1980) in their studies on parental influences on autonomy and identity development in adolescents. The parenting styles under consideration are autocratic, democratic, and permissive. These styles are defined as follows:

Autocratic: The youth is not permitted to express his/.her views on issues concerning him/her or to take initiative in self-regulation.

Democratic: The adolescent is encouraged to freely contribute to the discussion and solution of relevant issues, but the ultimate responsibility for the discussions remains invariably with the parents.

Permissive: The adolescent has a more influential role in making decisions on matters which concern him/her than do the parents. (Enright et al., 1989, p. 530)

Each participant indicated his or her perception of the parenting style utilized by his or her mother and father.

Hypothesis

The hypothesis to be tested is as follows: adopted adolescents have lower self-esteem than non-adopted adolescents. This hypothesis was tested using stepwise multiple regression which resulted in correlations (Pearson product r) between all pairs of variables.

The current study was undertaken in an effort to address the discrepancy between the narrative literature and the existing empirical studies regarding adoptees and self-concept issues. The consensus of the narratives is that adoptees have greater difficulty forming an identity than non-adoptees and would, therefore, have lower self-esteem. This conclusion is supported by one of the empirical studies which found that adoptees had lower self-esteem than non-adoptees (Simmons, 1980). However, the other two studies reported no significant difference between adoptees and non-adoptees on self-concept issues (Norfvell & Guy, 1977; Stein & Hoopes, 1985). It is important to note that the terms self-concept and self-esteem are used interchangeably in the narrative literature where no distinctions are made between the two. In addition, the three empirical studies which have addressed this subject employed different instruments to measure self-concept as opposed to self-esteem. The present author has chosen to focusonly on self-esteem as defined by Coopersmith.

Data Analysis

Multiple regression was used to test the research hypothesis. The dependent variable was the Coopersmith Self-Esteem Inventory. The independent variables were age, sex, number of siblings, mother's parenting style, father's parenting style, mother's age at time of birth or adoption, father's age at time of birth or adoption, and adoptive or non-adoptive status. While adoptive or non-adoptive status is the variable of primary concern, the other variables were included in order to provide clues to further explain any significant differences between the groups.

The following chapter presents the data and the last chapter will contain the conclusion and summary.

RESULTS

The adopted and non-adopted groups were matched according to sex. There were 26 female and 18 male students in each group. The comparison group was randomly selected from the non-adopted participants. The average age of the adoptees was 19.3 years; the average age of the non-adoptees was 19.1 years.

Five of the adoptees were only children, 19 had one sibling, 10 had two siblings, six had three siblings, one had five siblings and one had ten brothers and sisters. Within the comparison group of non-adoptees one was an only child, 22 had one sibling, eight had two siblings, four had three siblings, four had four siblings, three had five siblings, and two had six siblings.

The data analysis yielded frequencies and a correlation matrix indicating relationships among all pairs of variables (Table 1). The multiple regression employed a stepwise correlation to examine the relationships between the Coopersmith Self-Esteem Inventory (CSEI) scores and each of the independent variables. The alpha level was .05. Adoptees were assigned a code number of 20; non-adoptees were assigned a code

number of 30. Although a positive correlation was found between scores on the Coopersmith Self-Esteem Inventory and adoptive status as hypothesized (r=.14; p = 11), the level of significance falls short of the .05 level set by the researcher. No significant relationship was found between adoptive status and CSEI scores.

Results indicated significant correlations (p<.05) between adoptive status and the following: mother's parenting style, mother's age at time of birth or adoption, and father's age at time of birth or adoption, and father's age at time of birth or adoption (Table 1). Parenting styles were given the following code numbers: permissive 1, democratic 2, and autocratic 3. The larger the number, the more autocratic the parenting style. The negative correlation (r=-.18; p<.05) indicates that adoptees perceive their mothers to be more autocratic than non-adoptees. The negative correlation between mother's age at time of birth and adoptive status (r=-.29; p<.05) indicates that mothers of adoptees tend to be older than mothers of non-adoptees. The same is found to be true for fathers (r=-.29; p<.05).

Four (9.1%) of the adoptees reported that their mother's parenting style was autocratic, 15 (34.1%) noted that their mother's style was democratic, while the remaining 25 (56.8%) perceived their mother style to be permissive. None of the non-adoptees perceived their mother's parenting style to be autocratic, 14 (31.8%) felt their mother's style was democratic, and 30 (68.2%) indicated they had a permissive mother.

The mothers of the adoptees ranged in age from 22 to 40 at the time the child was adopted yielding a mean of 30.05, a median of 30.00 and a standard deviation of 4.71. The mothers of the non-adoptees ranged in age from 18 to 45 at the time of the child's birth yielding a mean of 26.80, a median of 25.00, and a standard deviation of 5.98.

The age range of the fathers of the adoptees was 24 to 45 at the time of the child's adoption. The mean of the father's age was 3.93, the median 33.00, and the standard deviation 5.02. The age range of the fathers of the non-adoptees was 19 to 45. At the

time of the child's birth yielding a mean of 28.57, a median of 27.50, and a standard deviation of 6.20.

The scores on the Coopersmith Self-Esteem Inventory for the adopted group ranged from 24 to a perfect score of 100 (Table 2). There were four scores of 100 in this group. The mean score for adoptees was 74.64 (compared to a mean score of 69.2 for the norm group), the median 78, and the standard deviation 20.06. The scores for the non-adopted comparison group ranged from 48 to 100. Four members of this group also scored 100. The μmean score for the non-adoptee was slightly higher at 79.36 (the means for all variables can be found in Appendix IV), the median was 84, and the standard deviation 14.59. It is important to note that these means are higher than those found by Coopersmith in the norm Group (X=69.2; SD=19.2).

Discussion

In comparing the narrative literature on adopted children with the empirical studies in regard to identity issues, it is apparent that a paradox exists. The narrative accounts indicate that for the adoptee the past is nonexistent and/or shrouded in secrecy. Yet is is this very past that is supposed to anchor the roots that provide nourishment for the future (Stone, 1972; Winnicott, 1966). The majority of the literature consists of case studies and professional opinions that would lead one to believe that adoption itself creates a state of rootlessness in a child which leads to difficulty in identity development in adolescence (Schoenberg, 1974; Stone, 1972; Triseliotis, 1973). Narrative accounts written by adoptees and clinical case studies concur. Many adoptees feel that the benefit of knowing biological origins is underestimated by non-adopted people. This would lead to the assumption that adoptees would experience more anxiety in developing a high sense at self-esteem than non-adoptees.

Adoptive status, however, does not exist in isolation. The personalities and attitudes of all members of the adoptee's world enter into the complexities of identity formation in the adopted adolescent. Stone (1972) asserts that clinical case studies are

biased because therapists see only those adoptees who are having problems. Adoptive parents are quick to seek professional help, often fearing that "bad blood" is the cause of their child's problem. Norvell and Guy (1977) speculate that negative elements incorporated in an adolescent's identity are more likely to stem from problems within the home rather than adoptive status. Some of the subjects in the Stein and Hoopes (1985) study "reported that the fact of adoption actually enhanced their feelings of self-worth by creating a feeling of 'specialness' because of their 'chosen' status" (p. 37). The questionable validity of the narrative accounts and case studies have led researchers to empirically examine the effects of adoptive status on human development.

The majority of the empirical studies report that adoptees do not experience greater difficulties in establishing an identity and positive self-concept in adolescence compared to non-adoptees. However, this conclusion is based on only two of the three studies of adoptees and self-concept (Norvell & Guy, 1977; Stein & Hoopes, 1985). Simmons (1980) found conflicting results indicating that adoptees did experience greater difficulty in the area of identity development than non-adoptees. It was hypothesized in this study that there would be a relationship between adoptive status and level of self-esteem as measured by the Coopersmith Self-Esteem Inventory. However, the results indicated the contrary to be true. While the scores for the adoptees yielded a wider range, and a lower mean and median, the results are not significant at the .05 (r-.14; p=.11). These results clearly support the previous studies undertaken by Norvell and Guy (1977) and Stein and Hoopes (1985). consequently, the indications are that measurable self-esteem is not effected by adoptive status.

Results indicating significant data (mother's parenting style, mother's age at time of birth or adoption, and father's age at time of birth or adoption) are congruent with previous literature. Adoptees who participated in this study perceived their mothers to be more autocratic and reported both parents to be older than non-adoptees.

Regarding mother's parenting style, nine percent of the adoptees reported having autocratic mothers; none in the comparison group perceived this style. This is congruent with the literature which recognizes an abundance of protectiveness by parents of their adopted children (Kirk, 1984) and the threatening aspect of sexual development, strivings for individuation and genealogical curiosity of the adolescent adoptee (Sorosky et al., 1977, 1978). Subsequent causes for the more autocratic parenting style of mothers of adoptees may be the incongruous role obligations of the adoptive mother (Kirk, 1959). The inability to experience conception, pregnancy, and childbirth, which are social and cultural as well as biological roles, may account for maternal insecurity and discomfort in dealing with the adoptive status of her child (Sorosky et al., 1975). By utilizing an autocratic parenting style, the adoptive mother may be attempting to fortify her status as a mother which was so difficult to accomplish in the beginning. The differentiation of the child into a unique individual may be a threat to her status as a mother.

The results of this study regarding parents' age at the time of the birth or adoption of the child are also congruent with the literature. Sorosky, Baran, and Pannor (1976, 1978) found adoptive parents to be on the average eight years older than biological parents. The reason given for this is that most married couples try to conceive before deciding to adopt. The parents of the adoptees (n=44) in this study were on the average three years older than the parents of the non-adopted individuals (n=44).

This study has augmented the body of literature on the subject of ;adoptive status and self-esteem and leaves the Simmons (1980) study as the sole empirical support of the hypothesis under consideration. Simmons's method of sample selection, however, differs markedly from the other studies. Perhaps by advertising for adopted participants, he attracted unhappy and dissatisfied volunteer subjects who hoped to attribute dysfunctional characteristics to their adoptive status. Simmons admits that the adoptees in his sample may differ from other adoptees in different but unrecognized

ways. "The defensive organization of denial, acting out, and compensatory processes may have prompted subjects to volunteer out of a counter-phobic type motivation" (p. 63).

A great deal of further study in this area is indicated. Adoptive status is not visibly obvious and securing and adequate sample size is a time consuming procedure. Difficulty in research is complicated by a wide diversity of attitudes among adoptees. However, little diversity is included in the research samples. Stein and Hoopes (1985) studied high school students ages 15-18. Norvell and Guy (1977) sampled college students ages 18-25. The current researcher sampled college undergraduates ages 18-21. Simmons (1980), on the other hand, gathered the most diverse sample ranging in age from 18 to 30. Where the sample was diverse, deficiencies in self-concept among adoptees was found. Perhaps this is an explanation for the varying outcomes of these empirical studies.

Other researchers have alluded to the intricacies involved in studying adoptees. Adelberg (1986), in comparing searching and non-searching adoptees, discovered that low self-esteem is a factor in a adoptee's decision to search for his or her origins. Shaw (1984) points out that the way in which researchers formulate their questions to adoptees may shape the results. Other variables which need to be studied and perhaps expanded are sample size, sampling procedures, and the validity of instruments administered. A phenomenological research approach using interviewing methods and techniques, rather than standardized objective instruments, may yield a truer picture of the unique nature of adopted individuals.

Implications

As previously mentioned, the purpose of this study was to examine the relationship between adoptive status and self-esteem in adolescents. The results indicated that adoptive status is not a significant determinant of measurable self-esteem.

Therefore, what are the implications for those who work with adopted adolescents in schools or other counseling environments? Adoptees exhibit the same warning signs

of emotional dysfunction as non-adoptees. Careful observation of students is recommended in order to identify those with a negative self-concept and low self-esteem. Warning signs include poor peer relations, suspected family problems, depression, self-statements of degradation and inadequacy, maladaptive classroom behavior, frequent and prolonged absenteeism, poor academic performance unrelated to ability, suspected drug abuse, and talk of suicide. Counselor intervention with these students should be aimed at empathic understanding of the adolescent's feelings about himself or herself.

Adoptive status provides an added dimension to an individual which may or may not be a factor related to self-esteem and identity formation. Ascertaining early in the relationship whether the client is adopted would seem to be critical. It is important for the counselor not to make any assumptions regarding the influence of adoptive status on the adolescent. Chess (1943) warns that it is dangerous "to assume the fact of adoption to be a source of danger and anxiety which must be kept in mind constantly as a potential difficulty and to assume that the fact of adoption is of no importance" (p. 7). Although the issue is inconclusive, adoptive status may be a powerful influence on the adoptee. The fact of adoption, including time spent in foster care, should be addressed when counseling the adopted adolescent. Feelings related to this issue must be explored in a non-judgmental manner.

As previously stated, identity related difficulties in adoptees may stem from family problems (Triseliotis, 1973). Family therapy may be indicated. Open communication between parent and adolescent regarding adoption-related matters must be encouraged. Adoptive parents need to be made aware that an adopted adolescent's interest in his or her origins is a normal part of the identity formation process (Rautman, 1949; Sants, 1964; Sorosky et al., 1978; Toolan, 1967). In some cases the role of the practitioner may be to increase the awareness of parents who do not understand the adoptee's interest in his or her biological family background.

Conclusion

The development of identity, self-concept, and self-esteem are complex issues for all adolescents particularly for those who are adopted. For the adoptee the integration of the shadowy or unknown past into the common identity struggles experienced by most adolescents and young adults compounds the process of identity development. This is a unique dimension for the adopted adolescent in his or her attempt to know himself or herself and establish agreement between the self-concept and the concept of the ideal self (Herbert, 1984). The verdict is not yet in on whether adopted status per se is a determinant of identity confusion in adolescence.

References

Adelberg, R. (1986). A comparison study of searching and non-searching adult adoptees. Dissertation Abstracts International, 46, 4420B. (University Microfilms No 04194209)

Bernard, V. (1953). Applications of psychoanalytic concepts to adoption agency practice. In M. Heiman (Ed.), Psychoanalysis and social work (pp. 169-209(. York: International Universities Press.

Blos, P. (1967). The second individuation process of adolescence. Psychoanalysis Study of the Child, 22, 162-186.

Chess, S. (1953). The adopted child grows up. Child Study, 30, 6-8.

Clothier, F. (1939). Some aspects of the problem of adoption. Mental Hygiene, 27, 222-230.

Coopersmith, S. (1987). Self-esteem inventories. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.

Elduson, B. T., & Livermore, J. B., (1953). Complicatons in therapy with adopted children. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 23, 795-802.

Enright, R. D., Lapsley, D. K., Drivas, A. E., & Fehr, L. A., (1980). Parental influences on the development of adolescent autonomy and identity. Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 9(6), 529-545.

Erikson, E. H. (1959). Identity and the life style: Selected papers. Psychological Issues, 1, 1-171.

Evans, R. I. (1967). Dialogue with Erik Erikson. New York: Harper & Row.

Frisk, M. (1964). Identity problems and confused conceptions of the genetic ego in adopted children during adolescence. Acta Paedo Psychiatrica, 31, 6-12.

Haimes, E., & Timms, N. (1985). Adoption, identity and social policy: The search for distant relatives. Brookfield, VT: Gower Publishing.

Herbert, M. (1984). Causes and treatment of behavior problems in adoptive children. In P. Bean (Ed.), Adoption (pp. 83-99). New York: Tavistock.

Hubbard, G. L. (1947). Who am I? The Child, 11, 130-133.

Kirk, H. D. (1959). A dilemma of adoptive parenthood: incongruous role obligations. Marriage & Family Living, 21, (4), 316-328.

Kirk, H. D. (1984). Shared fate. Port Angeles, WA: Ben-Simon Publications.

Komitzer, M. (1971). The adopted adolescent and the sense of identity. Child Adoption, 66, 43-48.

Lawton, J. J., & Gross, S. Z., (1964). Review of [sychiatric literature on adopted children. Archives of General Psychiatry, 11, 636-644.

Lifton, B. J. (1975). Twice Born. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Lifton, B. J. (1979). Lost and found. New York: Dial Press.

Marcus, C. (1981). Who is my mother? Toronto: Macmillan.

McWhinnie, A. M. (1967). Adopted children, how they grow up. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

McWhinnie, A. M. (1969). The adopted child in adolescence. In G. Caplan & S. Lebovici (Eds.), Adolescence: Psychosocial perspectives (pp. 133-142). New York: Basic Books.

Norvell, M., & Guy, R. F. (1977). A comparison of self-concept in adopted and non-adopted adolescents. Adolescence, 12(47), 443-447.

Offord, D. R., Aponte, J. F. & Cross, L. F. (1969). Presenting sympotomatology of adopted children. Archives of General Psychiatry, 20, 110-116.

Osterriety, P. A. (1969). Adolescence: Some psychological aspects. In G. Caplan & S. Lebovici (Eds.), Adolescence: Psychosocial perspectives (pp. 11-21). New York: Basic Books.

Pringle, M. L. (1967). Adoption facts and fallacies. London: National Bureau for Co-operation in child care.

Rautman, A. L. (1949). Adoptive parents need help, too. Mental Hygiene, 33, 424-431.

Reid, J. H. (1957). Principles, values, and assumptions underlying adoption practice. Social Work, 2, 22-27.

Rogers, R. (1969). The adolescent and the "hidden" parent. Comprehensive Psychiatry, 10(4), 296-301.

Sants, H. J. (1964). Genealogical bewilderment in children with substitute parents. British Journal of Medical Psychology, 37, 133-141.

Schechter, M. D. (1960). Observations on adopted children. Archives of General Psychiatry, 10, 109-118.

Schechter, M. D., Simmons, J. Q., III, & Work, H. H. (1964). Emotional problems in the adoptee. Archives of General Psychiatry, 10, 109-118.

Schoenberg, C. (1974). On adoption and identity. Child Welfare, 53(9), 549.

Schwartz, E. M. (1970). The family romance fantasy in children adopted in infancy. Child Welfare, 49(7), 386-391.

Shaw, M. (1984). Growing up adopted. In P. Bean (Ed.), Adoption, (pp. 113-127). New York: Tavistock.

Simmons, W. V. (1980). A study of identity formation in adoptees. Dissertation Abstracts International, 40, 5832B. (Order No. 8011451, University of Detroit, 1979).

Simon, N. M., & Sentura, A. G. (1966). Adoption and psychiatric illness. American Journal of Psychiatry, 122, 858-868.

Sorosky, A. D., Baran, A., & Pannor, R. (1975). Identity conflicts in adoptees. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 45(1), 18-27.

Sorosky, A. D., Baran, A., & Pannor, R. (1977). Adoption and the adolescent: An overview. Adolescent Psyciatry, 5, 54-72.

Sorosky, A. D., Baran, A., & Pannor, R. (1978). The adoption triangle. Garden City, NY: Anchor Press/Doubleday.

Stein, L. M. & Hoopes, J. L. (1985). Identity formation in the adopted adolescent: The Delaware family study. New York: Child Welfare League of America.

Stone, F. H. (1972). Adoption and identity. Child Psychiatry and Human Development, 2(3), 120-128.

Tec, L. & Gordon, S. (1967). The adopted child's adaptation to adolescence. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 37(2), 401.

Triseliotis, J. (1973). In search of origins. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Triseliotis, J. (1983). Identity and security in adoption and long-term fostering. Adoption and Fostering, 7(1), 22-31.

Triseliotis, J. (1984). Obtaining birth certificates. In P. Bean (Ed.), Adoption (pp. 38-53). New York: Tavistock.

Wellisch, E. (1952). Children without genealogy-a problem of adoption. Mental Health, 13, 41-42.

Winnicott, D. W. (1966). Adopted children in adolescence. In H. Lewis (Ed.), Medical Aspects of Child Adoption (P. 42). Petersham, Surrey, England: Standing Conference of Societies Registered for Adoption.

Table 1

PEARSON CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS

KEY

LINE 1=THE CORRELATION COEFFICIENT
LINE 2=THE NUMBER OF CASES IN THE STUDY
LINE 3=THE LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE

	CS	AGE	GENDER	SIBLINGS	M-STYLE	D-STYLE	M-AGE	D-AGE
COOPER	1.00 (88) P=.							
AGE	-.09 (88) P=.21							
SEN	-.05 (88) P=.31	-.05 (88) P=.30						
SIB	.04 (82) P=.36	-.12 (82) P=.14	-.05 (82) P=.32					
M-STY	-.12 (88) P=.13	.23 (88) P=.02	.01 (88) P=.48	-.18 (82) P=.05				
D-STY	-.13 (87) P=.13	.12 (87) P=.13	-.07 (87) P-.27	.05 (81) P=.34	.41 (87) P=.00			
M-AGE	-.07 (87) P=.25	.08 (87) P=.24	.01 (87) P=.46	.25 (81) P=.01	-.06 (87) P=.28	.03 (86) P=.38		
D-AGE	-.09 (88) P=.22	.08 (88) P=.22	.02 (88) P=.44	.18 (82) P=.06	-.05 (88) P=.33	.03 (87) P=.39	.91 (87) P=.00	
STATUS	.14 (88) P=.11	-.10 (88) P=.18	.00 (88) P=.50	.04 (82) P=.38	-.18 (88) P=.05	-.08 (87) P=;.23	-.29 (87) P=.00	-.29 (88) P=.00

Table 2

Coopersmith Self-Esteem Inventory

Scores by Adoptive Status

Group	Range	Mean	Median	SD
Adopted	24-100	74.64	78.00	20.06
Non-adopted	48-100	79.36	84.00	14.59